



# Weak-mixing implies sensitive dependence<sup>☆</sup>

Lianfa He, Xinhua Yan<sup>\*</sup>, Lingshu Wang

<sup>a</sup> College of Mathematics and Information Science, Hebei Normal University, Shijiazhuang 050016, PR China

Received 20 June 2003

Available online 2 September 2004

Submitted by C.E. Wayne

## Abstract

Let  $X$  be a metric space,  $\mathcal{B}$  the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $X$ , and  $\mu$  a probability measure on  $(X, \mathcal{B})$ . In this note, for a measure-preserving map  $T$  (respectively a measure-preserving semi-flow  $\varphi$ ) on  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , we prove that if  $\text{supp } \mu = X$ , and  $T$  (respectively  $\varphi$ ) is weak-mixing, then  $T$  (respectively  $\varphi$ ) has sensitive dependence.

© 2004 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Measure-preserving map; Measure-preserving semi-flow; Weak-mixing; Sensitive dependence

## 1. Introduction

Suppose  $(X, d)$  is a metric space with a metric  $d$ . Write  $Z^+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$  and  $R^+ = [0, +\infty)$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  denote the  $\sigma$ -algebra of Borel subsets of  $X$ , and  $\mu$  be a probability measure on  $(X, \mathcal{B})$ . Throughout the paper,  $T$  is a measure-preserving map on  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , i.e., for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  we have  $\mu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}B)$ , and  $\varphi$  is a measure-preserving semi-flow on  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , i.e.,  $\varphi$  is a semi-flow on  $X$ , and for any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$  and  $t \in R^+$  we have  $\mu(B) = \mu(\varphi_t^{-1}B)$ , and  $\text{supp } \mu = X$ .

- $T$  (respectively  $\varphi$ ) is called weak-mixing if for any  $A, B \in \mathcal{B}$ , we have

<sup>☆</sup> Project Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (10371030).

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: [lianfa88@heinfo.net](mailto:lianfa88@heinfo.net) (L. He), [yxh823@163.com](mailto:yxh823@163.com) (X. Yan).

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\mu(A \cap T^{-i}B) - \mu(A)\mu(B)| = 0$$

$$\left( \text{respectively } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t |\mu(A \cap \varphi_s^{-1}B) - \mu(A)\mu(B)| ds = 0 \right).$$

- $T$  (respectively  $\varphi$ ) has sensitive dependence if there exists  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $x \in X$  and any open neighborhood  $V_x$  of  $x$ , there exists  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  (respectively  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ) such that

$$\sup\{d(T^n x, T^n y) : y \in V_x\} > \delta$$

$$(\text{respectively } \sup\{d(\varphi_t x, \varphi_t y) : y \in V_x\} > \delta).$$

- A subset  $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$  (respectively  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ ) is called relatively dense, if there exists  $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  (respectively  $L \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ) such that for any  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  (respectively  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ) we have

$$S \cap \{k, k+1, \dots, k+N-1\} \neq \emptyset$$

$$(\text{respectively } S \cap (t, t+L) \neq \emptyset).$$

- A subset  $S \subset \mathbb{Z}^+$  (respectively Lebesgue measurable set  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^+$ ) is called the positive upper density if

$$\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{k+1} \text{Card}\{0 \leq j \leq k : j \in S\} > 0$$

$$\left( \text{respectively } \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} l(S \cap [0, t]) > 0 \right),$$

where  $l(S)$  is Lebesgue measure of  $S$ .

It is well known that sensitive dependence characterizes the unpredictability of chaotic phenomenon. The dependence is the essential condition of various definitions of a system to be chaotic. Therefore, when does a system have sensitive dependence? This question has gained some attention in more recent papers, for example, [1–4]. The authors in [4] proved the result as follows.

**Proposition.** Suppose  $\text{supp } \mu = X$ ,  $T$  is weak-mixing, and satisfies the property

(P) for any non-empty open set  $U \subset X$ , there exists a sequence  $\{n_k\}$  with positive upper density such that  $U \cap (\bigcap_{k \geq 0} T^{-n_k} U) \neq \emptyset$ ,

then  $T$  has sensitive dependence.

The first aim in this paper is to show that the proposition can be improved by using Khintchine's theorem in [5], i.e., we prove the following

**Theorem A.** If  $T$  is weak-mixing, then  $T$  has sensitive dependence.

The second aim is to show that the similar result for measure-preserving semi-flows can be obtained by using corresponding Khintchine's theorem in [6], i.e., we prove the following

**Theorem B.** *If  $\varphi$  is weak-mixing, then  $\varphi$  has sensitive dependence.*

## 2. Proof of theorem A

**Lemma 2.1** (Khintchine's theorem [5]). *For any  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , if  $\mu(B) > 0$ , then for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the set  $\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : \mu(B \cap T^{-k}B) \geq \mu(B)^2 - \varepsilon\}$  is relatively dense in  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ .*

**Lemma 2.2.** *If  $T$  has not sensitive dependence, then there exist two non-empty disjoint open sets  $U$  and  $V$  in  $X$  such that the set  $S = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : T^k V \cap U = \emptyset\}$  has positive upper density.*

**Proof.** Choose  $\delta > 0$  such that for every  $x \in X$ , there exists  $y \in X$  satisfying  $d(x, y) > 4\delta$ . Since  $T$  has not sensitive dependence, there is a point  $x \in X$  and a neighborhood  $V_x$  of  $x$  such that

$$\text{diam}(T^n V_x) = \sup\{d(T^n x', T^n y') : x', y' \in V_x\} \leq 2\delta \quad (\forall n \geq 0).$$

Take  $0 < \varepsilon < \delta$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon) = \{y \in X : d(x, y) < \varepsilon\} \subset V_x$ . As  $\text{supp } \mu = X$ , we have  $\mu(B(x, \varepsilon)) > 0$ . According to Lemma 2.1,  $S = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : B(x, \varepsilon) \cap T^{-k}B(x, \varepsilon) \neq \emptyset\}$  is relatively dense in  $\mathbb{Z}^+$ . Now for any  $k \in S$ , we can find  $z \in B(x, \varepsilon) \cap T^{-k}B(x, \varepsilon)$ , then  $T^k z \in B(x, \varepsilon) \cap T^k B(x, \varepsilon)$ , and for any  $y \in B(x, \varepsilon)$ , we have

$$d(T^k y, x) \leq d(T^k y, T^k z) + d(T^k z, x) \leq 2\delta + \varepsilon < 4\delta.$$

This shows  $T^k B(x, \varepsilon) \subset B(x, 4\delta)$ ,  $\forall k \in S$ .

Now let  $V = B(x, \varepsilon)$ ,  $U = X \setminus \overline{B(x, 4\delta)}$ , then for any  $k \in S$  we have  $T^k V \cap U = \emptyset$ . Moreover, since  $S$  is relatively dense, we can find  $N \geq 1$  such that for any  $i \geq 0$  we have

$$S \cap \{i, i+1, \dots, i+N-1\} \neq \emptyset.$$

Consequently

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{m+1} \text{Card}\{0 \leq k \leq m : k \in S\} \geq \frac{1}{N} > 0. \quad \square$$

**Proof of Theorem A.** If the conclusion does not hold, then by Lemma 2.1, there exist non-empty open sets  $U, V \subset X$  such that  $S = \{k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : T^k V \cap U = \emptyset\}$  has positive upper density. Also since  $V \cap T^{-k}U \subset T^{-k}(T^k V \cap U) = \emptyset$  ( $\forall k \in S$ ), so  $\mu(V \cap T^{-k}U) = 0$  ( $\forall k \in S$ ).

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\mu(V \cap T^{-k}U) - \mu(V)\mu(U)| &\geq \sum_{k=0, k \in S}^{n-1} \mu(V)\mu(U) \\ &= \text{Card}\{0 \leq k \leq n-1 : k \in S\} \mu(V)\mu(U). \end{aligned}$$

As  $\text{supp } \mu = X$ , and  $V, U$  are all open sets, we know  $\mu(V)\mu(U) > 0$ . This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} |\mu(V \cap T^{-k}U) - \mu(V)\mu(U)| \\ & \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \text{Card}\{0 \leq k \leq n-1: \mu(V \cap T^{-k}U) > 0\} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the weak-mixing of  $T$ .  $\square$

### 3. Proof of Theorem B

**Lemma 3.1** (Khintchine's theorem [6]). *If for  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , we have  $\mu(B) > 0$ , then the set  $\{t \in \mathbb{R}^+: \mu(B \cap \varphi_t^{-1}B) > \lambda\mu(B)^2\}$  ( $\lambda < 1$ ) is relatively dense in  $\mathbb{R}^+$ .*

Here we need to point out that Khintchine's theorem in [6] is given for measure-preserving flows on  $(X, \mathcal{B}, \mu)$ , but we can see from its proof that it also holds for measure-preserving semi-flows.

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $\varphi$  has not sensitive dependence, then there exist open sets  $V, U \subset X$  such that the set*

$$S := \{t \in \mathbb{R}^+: V \cap \varphi_t^{-1}U = \emptyset\}$$

*has positive upper density.*

**Proof.** Choose  $\delta > 0$  such that for any  $x \in X$ , there exists  $y \in X$  satisfying  $d(x, y) > 8\delta$ . Since  $\varphi$  has not sensitive dependence, there is  $0 < \sigma < \delta$  and  $x \in X$  such that  $\text{diam}(\varphi_t(B(x, \sigma))) < \delta$  ( $\forall t \geq 0$ ). Take  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  such that

$$\varphi_t(B(x, 2\delta)) \subset B(x, 8\delta), \quad \forall t \in [0, \varepsilon].$$

Let  $V = B(x, \sigma)$ , as  $\text{supp } \mu = X$ , so  $\mu(V) > 0$ . According to Lemma 3.1, the set

$$S_1 := \{t \in \mathbb{R}^+: V \cap \varphi_t V \neq \emptyset\} \supset \{t \in \mathbb{R}^+: V \cap \varphi_t^{-1}V \neq \emptyset\}$$

is relatively dense in  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . Hence there exists  $L > 0$  such that for any  $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$  we have

$$S_1 \cap (t, t+L) \neq \emptyset.$$

Now for any  $t \in S_1$ , because  $V \cap \varphi_t V \neq \emptyset$ , and  $\text{diam}(\varphi_t(V)) < \delta$ , we have  $V \cup \varphi_t(V) \subset B(x, \sigma + \delta) \subset B(x, 2\delta)$ , and therefore

$$\varphi_\tau(V) \subset B(x, 8\delta), \quad \forall \tau \in [t, t+\varepsilon].$$

Let  $U := X \setminus \overline{B(x, 8\delta)}$ ,  $S_2 := \bigcup_{t \in S_1} [t, t+\varepsilon]$ , then for any  $\tau \in S_2$  we have  $U \cap \varphi_\tau(V) = \emptyset$ , i.e.,  $V \cap \varphi_\tau^{-1}U = \emptyset$ . Consequently  $S_2 \subset S$ , and

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} l(S \cap [0, t]) &\geq \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} l(S_2 \cap [0, t]) \\
&\geq \limsup_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{k(L+1)} l(S_2 \cap [0, k(L+1)]) \\
&\geq \frac{k\varepsilon}{k(L+1)} = \frac{\varepsilon}{L+1} > 0. \quad \square
\end{aligned}$$

**Proof of Theorem B.** If the conclusion does not hold, then by Lemma 3.2, there exists non-empty open sets  $U, V \subset X$  such that  $S := \{t \in \mathbb{R}^+ : V \cap \varphi_t^{-1}U = \emptyset\}$  has positive upper density. Also as  $\text{supp } \mu = X$ , so  $\mu(V)\mu(U) > 0$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \int_0^t |\mu(V \cap \varphi_s^{-1}U) - \mu(V)\mu(U)| ds &= 0 \\
&\geq \mu(V)\mu(U) \limsup_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} l(S \cap [0, t]) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the weak-mixing of  $\varphi$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] J. Bank, J. Brooks, G. Cairns, G. Davis, D. Stacey, On Devaney's definition of chaos, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 99 (1992) 332–334.
- [2] H. Kato, Everywhere chaotic homeomorphisms on manifolds and  $k$ -dimensional Merger manifolds, *Topology Appl.* 72 (1996) 1–17.
- [3] E. Glasner, B. Weiss, Sensitive dependence on initial conditions, *Nonlinearity* 6 (1993) 1067–1075.
- [4] C. Abraham, G. Bian, B. Ladre, Chaotic properties of mapping on a probability space, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 266 (2002) 420–431.
- [5] K. Petersen, *Ergodic Theory*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1983.
- [6] V.V. Nemiskii, V.V. Stepanov, *Qualitative Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1960.